

REMARKS

A Request For Continued Examination Has Been Filed

Initially, the Applicants note that a Request for Continued Examination has been filed at the same time as this Amendment, along with the required fee. Thus, the Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the finality of the outstanding Office Action and enter and consider this Amendment. 37 CFR § 1.114.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 5 and 7 have been rejected as being anticipated by Winder. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 5 has been amended to recite a universal collar having a first flange and a second flange, “wherein said flanges define notches on a side of the universal collar.” The Examiner has identified elements 52 and 58 as the flanges in Winder, but neither of these flanges, let alone both of them, defines notches on a side of a universal collar. *See*, Figs. 4, 5, and 6 of Winder. Thus, Winder does not teach what is claimed. And while Applicants appreciate that the claim does not positively recite the container, the Applicants maintain that the relationship between the collar and the container is useful in defining the structure of the collar. As argued previously, no part of Winder’s top edge 44 circumscribes a portion of the container 16. *See*, Fig. 6 of Winder.

Claims 2 and 5-7 have been rejected as being anticipated by Taljaard. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 2 has been amended to recite a universal collar having a first flange and a second flange, “wherein said flanges define notches on a side of the universal collar opposite said rib.” The figures in Taljaard show that the elements the Examiner has identified as the flanges (elements 11, 15, 46, 52/54) do not define notches on a side of a universal collar opposite a rib. Likewise, claim 5 has been amended to recite a universal collar having a first flange and a second flange, “wherein said flanges define notches on a side of the universal collar.” Again, the flanges of Taljaard do not define notches on a side of a universal collar. Thus, Taljaard does not teach what is claimed. Moreover, claim 2 recites that the first and second flanges are connected on a forward side by a vertically extending rib. The Examiner has cited to the “filled in portions” between element 23 (Fig. 1), or element 64 (Fig. 3), and the Applicants object to the characterization of these features as “ribs.” In any event, neither of the

so-called ribs of Taljaard extends between two flanges, thereby *connecting* the two flanges. In the Advisory Action mailed 8/13/09, the Examiner asserts that “figure 2 shows a rib extending between 11 and 15.” But viewing Figs. 1 and 2 at the same time shows that what the Examiner had previously regarded as the ribs (sections between grooves 23) *does not* connect the flanges 11 and 15. Rather, section 12, which is more aptly described as a “body” and includes grooves 23 (see page 1, line 109), fits radially inside of the mount 11, and extends far beyond the flange portion of mount 11 (see position of label 12 in Fig. 2). Fig 2 clearly shows that the section 12/grooves 23 do not connect “flange” 11 to flange 15, as is required in the claim. Furthermore, the Examiner did not address in the Advisory Action additional distinctions pointed out by Applicants: claim 5 recites that the recess has a pair of upstanding sides that are circumferentially spaced from each other. Fig. 3 of Taljaard might show elements 52 and 54 axially spaced from one another (along the axis of the bore), but those features are not *circumferentially* spaced from one another. Fig. 4 of the subject application shows that the sides 56, 58 are circumferentially spaced from one another (that is, spaced from one another around the circumference of the circular shaped top edge 53). Since both recesses 51, 52 are defined within the top edge 53, their features are necessarily along the same circumference. *See*, Specification at p. 7, ll. 2-4 and Fig. 4. In addition, claim 7 recites that the top edge extends axially upward relative to the first flange, and the Examiner has not identified this recited feature in Taljaard.

Claim 5 has been rejected as being anticipated by Curie. Applicants disagree. Claim 5 has been amended to recite a universal collar having a first flange and a second flange, “wherein said flanges define notches on a side of the universal collar.” The Examiner has identified elements 37 and 39 of Curie as flanges, but neither of these flanges, let alone both of them, defines notches on a side of a universal collar. *See*, Figs. 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 of Curie. Thus, Curie does not teach what is claimed. Moreover, claim 5 recites a top edge defining a locating recess, the recess having a pair of upstanding sides circumferentially spaced from each other. Curie does not teach this, because the two sides of groove 37a are *radially* spaced from each other, rather than being circumferentially spaced. If one were to view Fig 3 from a top plan perspective, one would see an annular groove 37a with an annular base and an upstanding side at an outer radius location and an upstanding side at an inner radius location. These sides

are not even on the same circumference, let alone spaced from one another circumferentially. The Examiner asserts in the Advisory Action that “claim 5 does not define the location of the circumference but merely refers to the sides as being circumferentially spaced thus leaving the definition of what is considered circumferentially spaced open for interpretation.” The Applicants disagree. Both recesses 51, 52 are defined within the top edge 53, so their features are necessarily along the same circumference. *See*, Specification at p. 7, ll. 2-4 and Fig. 4. In any event, where the two sides of grooves 37a are not even along the same circumference, they cannot be said to meet the limitation of “circumferentially spaced.”

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, a Notice of Allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing in more detail, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

In the event that any fees are due with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 18-0987.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Weber, Reg. No. 46,069
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber
First National Tower - Fourth Floor
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456
Telephone: (330) 376-1242
Facsimile: (330) 376-9646
Attorney for Applicant(s)

September 23, 2009